



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/225,198	01/05/1999	ADAM J. CHEYER	SR11P016	2756

22918 7590 07/12/2004

PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. BOX 2168
MENLO PARK, CA 94026

EXAMINER

BULLOCK JR, LEWIS ALEXANDER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 07/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/225,198

Applicant(s)

CHEYER ET AL.

Examiner

Lewis A. Bullock, Jr.

Art Unit

2126

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 08 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): CD Requirements and Abstract objections.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.


Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-89.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____



Continuation of 2. NOTE: Applicant amended the claims to language that overcomes the prior art references, however, the examiner has been able to find references that meets the new claim limitations.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are unpersuasive. Applicants amendment of the agent language including a conversational protocol layer and a content layer would overcome the applied prior art references, however, the examiner has now found references that teach KQML having a a layer of conversational protocol defined by event types, i.e. a type of ask (ask one or ask_all primitive) along with parameters associated with the event types and a content layer comprising data elements associated with the event as disclosed in all independent claims. Also regarding claim 48, prior art references published by some of the Applicants detailed that ICL has either one of the layers, in particular the content layer, as disclosed in that claim however, the references do not allude to the ICL having both layers. Page 17, lines 12-30 attempts to illustrate that the events are different from the communication acts of KQML, however, the Examiner has not been able to ascertain how they are different from this portion of the specification or any other parts of the specification. It would seem that KQML's ask primitives are events that contain parameter information. Applicant would have to amend the claims or explain how the primitives of KQML would not represent events in order for the Examiner to not equate a layer of KQML primitives having parameter data to Applicant's conversational protocol layer defining events. In regards to claims 1-47 and 61-89, Applicant argues that the applied references, in particular Kiss, teaches the knowledge repository are represented by knowledge agents and merely ask the agents to retrieve information and is irrelevant to Applicants method of forming the goal satisfaction plan in order to perform actions. The examiner disagrees. The examiner cannot find any language within the claims that details that the service is not a data retrieval service. Therefore, the plan generated to retrieve information is a satisfaction plan to perform actions, i.e. to retrieve the data. In addition, Applicant's example of actions such as boil water, roast coffee beans, and grind the roasted coffee beans are illustrated actions that the invention could perform when solving a goal. It is equally seen from the claim language that the actions can also be the tasks distributed by the meta agent when processing its solution plan to accomplish its overall goal. Applicant argues that the meta agent is capable of backtracking and replanning is another illustrations that Kiss does not teach the invention. In response, the Examiner cannot find any limitations that the plan can not be reevaluated or modified while being implemented. Therefore, the teachings of Kiss just adds another benefit, but still meets the limitations of the claims as disclosed. Applicant then argues that Kiss does not teach using reasoning to formulate the dynamic solution plan. The examiner disagrees. Column 5, lines 25-27 detail that the meta agent contains knowledge of problem solving methodologies and distributed inferencing procedures. Column 5, lines 30-32, detail that the meta agent may maintain the domain-specific knowledge necessary to answer the query itself. Column 5, lines 33-39 detail that meta agent formulates a solution plan and formulates sub-plans in order to perform iterative and recursive procedures. Therefore, the solution plan is generated by the planning component of the meta agent based on domain independent coordination strategies or domain specific reasoning. The cited paragraph Applicant refers to refute the teachings of Kiss refers to how the plan is replanned and backtracked. Applicant then argues that in regards to claim 48, the combination, i.e. Martin1 and Martin2, do not teach a single request are coupled by one or more operators from a set of operators comprising a conditional execution operator or a parallel disjunctive operator. The examiner disagrees. First, it is pointed out that only one operator has to be shown in order for the limitation to be met. Applicant discloses that a conditional execution operator is represented by an arrow (pg. 23, lines 2-5). Page 10, details a mapping rule (request) submitted in ICL format by an information agent which denotes an arrow as well as other control operators that affect the interpretation of a rule. Therefore, the cited reference teaches conditional execution operators and meets the claim language as disclosed.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY